

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed April 8, 2009, claims 1-6 were rejected. Additionally, claim 6 is objected to. In response, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments place the present application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal.

For reference, proposed amendments are presented for claims 1 and 6. In particular, the proposed amendment for claim 1 is presented to recite that the asynchronous processor uses an internal clock and remains dormant in the absence of a clock failure event. A proposed amendment for claim 6 is presented to recite similar limitations. These proposed amendments are supported, for example, by the subject matter described in the specification at page 5, lines 6-20.

No claims are added or canceled.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 6 is objected to because the claim recites “bringing an electronic circuit arrangement in a pre-defined state,” which is grammatically incorrect. The proposed amendment for claim 6 recites “bringing an electronic circuit arrangement into a pre-defined state.” Applicant submits that this proposed amendment is grammatically correct. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Floyd et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,089,462, hereinafter Floyd). Additionally, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Floyd in view of Pohlmeier et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,959,014, hereinafter Pohlmeier). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Floyd and Pohlmeier for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites “an asynchronous processor arranged to receive said error signal and to bring the electronic circuit arrangement into a pre-defined state upon detection of the error signal, wherein the asynchronous processor uses an internal clock and remains dormant in the absence of a clock failure event” (emphasis added).

The Office Action states that Floyd purportedly discloses an asynchronous processor (Fig. 1, item 30 and 34A-B and column 1, lines 25-35) arranged to receive said error signal and to bring the electronic circuit into a pre-defined state upon detection of the error signal (column 3, lines 35-46). However, the service processors 34A-B disclosed by Floyd are not asynchronous processors. More specifically, Floyd does not disclose an asynchronous processor that uses an internal clock and remains dormant in the absence of a clock failure event.

The service processors disclosed by Floyd are not asynchronous processors. An asynchronous processor uses an internal clock whereas a synchronous processor utilizes an external clock. Floyd discloses the service processors 34A-B both run off of an external clock and therefore are synchronous processors. Floyd, column 3, lines 40-43. The service processors are not asynchronous processors as recited in claim 1, because they use external clocks.

In addition, Floyd does not disclose that the service processors 34A-B remain dormant in the absence of a clock failure event as an asynchronous processor would. The service processors perform many functions other than clock fault detection and are always active and constantly consume power. Floyd, column 2, lines 46-50. Floyd does not disclose that the service processors conserve power by remaining dormant in the absence of a clock failure event. Therefore, Floyd does not disclose an asynchronous processor that uses an internal clock and remains dormant in the absence of a clock failure event.

For the reasons presented above, Floyd does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Floyd does not disclose an asynchronous processor that uses an internal clock and remains dormant in the absence of a clock failure event, as recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts claim 1 is patentable over Floyd because Floyd does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim.

Independent Claim 6

Applicant respectfully asserts independent claim 6 is patentable over the cited reference at least for similar reasons to those stated above in regard to the rejection of independent claim 1. Claim 6 recites subject matter which is similar to the subject matter of claim 1 discussed above. Although the language of this claim differs from the language of claim 1, and the scope of these claims should be interpreted independently of other claims, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejection of these claims.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-5 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 2-5 are allowable based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2-5 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

In regard to claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is patentable over Floyd because Floyd does not teach all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 4 recites “A bus station for use in a bus system comprising an electronic circuit arrangement as claimed in claim 1” (emphasis added). The Office Action states that Floyd discloses a bus station for use in a bus system and cites Fig. 1 as disclosing a bus station. Office Action, page 3, lines 8-9. Fig. 1 depicts a block diagram of a multiprocessing system including a plurality of processors in a processor group that may be connected to other processor groups and includes two service processors that provide services to the processor group. However, Fig. 1 does not disclose a bus station for use in a bus system. Also, the specification does not disclose a bus station for use in a bus system. Thus, Floyd does not disclose a bus station for use in a bus system comprising an electronic circuit arrangement. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 4 is patentable over Floyd because Floyd does not disclose “a bus station for use in a bus system,” as recited in claim 4.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: June 8, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111